

EPA Official Record

Notes ID: B2E50D69DED419ED852578690055A5D9

From: William Nelson/NAR/USEPA/US

To: Dave Dickerson/R1/USEPA/US@EPA

Copy To: Barbara Bergen/NAR/USEPA/US@EPA; ElaineT Stanley/R1/USEPA/US@EPA

Delivered Date: 12/23/2009 10:18 AM EDT

Subject: Re: Coggeshall St flux

Dave,

I went back and looked at the Hot Spot flux data, as well as the paper we wrote, and the flux at NBH-2 was 0.2 kg / tidal cycle. That included both operational and non-operational days, but as a conservative number, I'd use 0.4 kg/day (0.88 lbs) as your number. By the way, I just looked at the new LTM PCB data and the mean is actually decreased in the lower harbor compared to '04, indicating that all the operational dredging hasn't caused any increases in the lower harbor - Merry Christmas! In addition, the locations in the upper harbor where there were slight increases were all in the immediate vicinity of the dredging locations, while those nearer the bridge were lower - Happy New Year!

Skip

▼ Dave Dickerson---12/21/2009 03:28:44 PM---Hi Barb and Skip - we're putting together a poster for the upcoming CAD cell proposal and I wanted

From: Dave Dickerson/R1/USEPA/US

To: Barbara Bergen/NAR/USEPA/US@EPA, William Nelson/NAR/USEPA/US@EPA

Cc: ElaineT Stanley/R1/USEPA/US@EPA

Date: 12/21/2009 03:28 PM

Subject: Coggeshall St flux

Hi Barb and Skip - we're putting together a poster for the upcoming CAD cell proposal and I wanted to double check the PCB flux value at Cogg. Street. I was planning on using a value of 0.5 lbs per day based on the info in the 1998 ROD (see p.7 - 0.11 kg/tidal cycle measured during the hot spots). Does this jive with the value you've been citing?? Thanks - Dave